

JAN 03 2007

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 10, 2006, and the Advisory Action dated December 5, 2006, have been received and considered. In this response, claims 1, 2, 5, 11-13, 15-17, 23-25, 27, 28, 32, 37-39, 41-43, 46, 51, and 53-56 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 18-20, 23-25, 28-32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 52-54

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 18-20, 23-25, 28-32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,222) in view of Croy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,825). The claims as amended recite features not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. For example, independent claim 1 recites accessing stored video content stored at a server. Similar features are recited by each of claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 18-20, 23-25, 28-32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 52-54. Neither Croy nor Harrison disclose accessing video content stored at a server. Harrison instead discloses receiving video content from a broadcast signal. *Harrison*, FIG. 2. Further, Croy does not remedy the deficiency of Harrison. Harrison and Croy therefore fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 18-20, 23-25, 28-32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 52-54.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 18-20, 23-25, 28-32, 34, 37-39, 42-47, 49 and 52-54 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 36, 50 and 51

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 36, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Croy et al. and further in view of Taylor, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,710,812). As explained above, independent claims 1, 16, 28, and 42, from which claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 36, 50 and 51 respectively depend, presently

PATENT

recite elements not disclosed or suggested by Harrison and Croy. Further, Taylor, Jr. does not remedy the deficiencies of Harrison and Croy. Accordingly, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 36, 50 and 51.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 9, 10, 21, 22, 35, 36, 50 and 51 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

1/3/2007
Date



Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146
Larson Newman Abel Polansky & White, L.L.P.
5914 West Courtyard Dr. Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)